

APR 03 2007

Application Serial No. 09/923,375
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2006

PATENT
Docket: CU-2613

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated October 3, 2006, the Examiner states that Claims 7-15 are pending, and Claims 7-15 are rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

In the Office Action, Claims 13 and 15 are objected to for being indential to Claims 12 and 14. Claim 13 has been cancelled, and the claim dependencies have been revised to overcome this objection.

In the Office Action, Claims 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ueda (US 6,714,314). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection.

The rejection indicates that Ueda discloses that when the user selects a lower contrast image to be printed, the selection inherently provides privacy protection, and when the user selects a greater contrast or original image for printing, the selection would be an image without privacy protection. The Applicant contends this interpretation of Ueda.

The Applicant considers that Ueda discloses that the contrast adjustment is related only to a printed image, and thus the contrast adjustment can not be applied apart from the printing command. Similar to this, the size order in Ueda can not be applied apart from the printing command. In Ueda, there is no teaching or disclosure that the contrast adjustment is for privacy protection. In Fig. 31(b) of Ueda, the MORE SOFT contrast image, the NOW contrast image, and the MORE STRONG contrast image are displayed concurrently, and thus do not function for the purpose of privacy protection.

The rejection also indicates Ueda discloses that the process for privacy protection in the image printing apparatus has a processing device for producing a protection processed image for applying a privacy protection process to the image to be output, wherein a controlling means for displaying either one of the protection processed image and the image to be output on the display device according to the designation by the user. The rejection further considers Ueda discloses that when the user selects a lower contrast image or smaller image to be printed out, the selection inherently provides privacy protection, and when the user selects a greater or original contrast, or a bigger size for the printed image, the selection would be an image without privacy protection. The Applicant contends these interpretations of

Application Serial No. 09/923,375
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2006

PATENT
Docket: CU-2613

Ueda.

In Ueda, the selection of contrast and size of the printed image is not related to a privacy protection process. When a user selects original or greater contrast, or a larger size print, privacy protection is not obtained regardless of whether a user wants to apply privacy protection. Alternatively, if a user wants to apply privacy protection, the user can not obtain an original, greater contrast, or larger size print. Thus, in Ueda, there is no teaching or suggestion of privacy protection being applied to the displayed image during a succession of operations for printing the image.

In view of the above, the Applicant does not consider that Ueda teaches the claimed process steps of "applying a privacy protection to the image to be output at the processing device, the privacy protection being applied apart from the printing command" and "displaying either one of the protection processed image and the image to be output on the display device according to the designation by a user."

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



April 3, 2007

Date

Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613